



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—THE NAHUATL-SPANISH DIALECT OF NICARAGUA.

To one who reads Prescott's "Conquest of Mexico," the splendor and magnificence of Montezuma's court seem marvellous, but not more marvellous than the resources themselves of his wonderful empire, as described by the native Spanish historians. According to these, when Cortes entered the capital of Anáhuac, it was not alone the national prosperity of its people that filled him with astonishment, it was not simply their curious customs nor their strange manners that caused him great surprise, but their extraordinary language; the amazing facility with which those about the king could clothe their thoughts in words, and the harmonious effects of the foreign tongue. This idiom, as Hubert Bancroft tells us in his "Native Races of the Pacific States," was the *lingua franca* of Mexico,—the language par excellence of Mexican civilization, that stretched across the immense plateau from the Gulf of California on the northwest to the Gulf of Mexico on the southeast for a distance of more than twelve hundred miles. It was, therefore, emphatically a dominant stock speech, and was used in court circles and in all official communications, just as the French of a few years ago; and the people of all newly-conquered territories were required to learn it. "Of all languages spoken on the American continent," remarks the same author, "the Aztec (Nahuatl) is the most perfect and finished, approaching in this respect the tongues of Europe and Asia, and actually surpassing many of them by its elegance of expression."

The celebrated Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg, author of a Quiché grammar, and of many other valuable works on Mexican lore, asserts of it that "*Des hauteurs les plus sublimes de la métaphysique, elle descend aux choses les plus vulgaires; avec une sonorité et une richesse d'expression qui n'appartiennent qu'à elle.*" But copiousness and flexibility are not the most striking characteristics of the Nahuatl tongue. It is an extremely polysynthetic kind of speech, in which the process of agglutination has the greatest sweep, so that not only words are built up in it to the extent of sixteen syllables, but the meaning of a whole sentence

even is often crowded into a single word. We are all familiar with such geographical proper-name combinations as Popocatepetl, "the smoking mountain." It has the Latin vowel-system, but certain consonants are wanting, such as *b, d, f, v, g, s*. Gender is marked by simple juxtaposition, and there is no regular declension, the different case-relations being denoted by various post- and prepositions. But the verb is richer in both mood and tense development than is usually found in the Neo-Latin idioms. I mention these few characteristics of the Nahuatl, as given by Bancroft, De Olmos and others, simply to show that it was a species of language with wholly opposite tendencies—a very strong synthetic development—to those of the extremely analytic speech with which it was brought into contact at the time of the conquest of Mexico; and we shall note further on more than one marked effect of the more complex system on the phonetics, word-formation and phrase-setting of the Spanish.

One of the "outlying colonies" of this powerful people, whom we have just seen occupying the great plain of Anáhuac, was the Nahuatl tribe, that took possession of and gave the name to that province of Central America now known as Nicaragua. It was these natives of Aztec blood and language that Gil Gonzales de Avila found there in 1521, when he discovered the country, and who were formally conquered in 1522 by his wily and unscrupulous rival, Pedro Avias, Governor of Panama. Not till some time after this, however, did the conquerors obtain full control of their province, when it was attached to the Captain-Generalcy (Audien-*cia*) of Guatamala, under which rule it remained till the outbreak of the revolution of 1821, thus making three hundred years of steady, uninterrupted Spanish dominion. At an early date after the Spanish occupation there sprang up a "mixed dialect, composed of a broken-down Nahuatl and a corrupt Spanish, which, at first, served as a means of communication between the conquerors and their subjects, and later became, to some degree, the usual tongue of the latter."¹

This *misch-dialect* spread over large districts of Central America and Mexico, and finally became "the current tongue of the half-breeds." The bulk of its word-supply is Spanish, which, for the most part, has preserved its sixteenth-century character, and with this, of course, many terms that are obsolete to-day. Besides these, as we shall see further on, it contains interesting marks of

¹ Cf. Brinton, Güegüence, Introduction, p. xvi.

Spanish home-dialect influence, and a number of new products created by engrafting on to Aztec words, either as a whole or reduced to the simple stem, the Romance flexional endings, just as we find them in the transference of German words to Neo-Latin soil. Frequently, however, we come upon entire phrases borrowed directly from the native idiom, which, the editor tells us, are so mutilated that they are scarcely recognizable, and in many cases render the interpretation of the text extremely difficult. In its syntax the general tradition of the old Spanish sentence is stuck to, but with a feeling so lax and unsteady that the breaking-down power of the native tongue becomes manifest in the removal of all flexional elements, and in a naked juxtaposition of nominal and verbal roots.¹

This dialect-text, which it is here proposed to examine, has just been published by Dr. Daniel G. Brinton, in his Library of Aboriginal American Literature, under the title "The Güegüence; a Comedy Ballet in the Nahuatl-Spanish Dialect of Nicaragua," and constitutes No. III of that series. It is printed, as the editor states, from a collection of two MSS made by Dr. Berendt in 1874, no part of which has ever before been translated. Both the age and the authorship are unknown. With reference to the former, the learned translator remarks, "it is probable that we may assign the early portion of the eighteenth century as the latest date for its composition, and there is some evidence that a more remote period is not improbable." He further thinks "there are weighty reasons for believing that it is the production of a native Indian or of a half-cast."

The piece covers a little over thirty-five octavo pages, and bears the double title "Baile del Güegüence ó Macho-Raton," which, I think, will be shown further on to have some significance with reference to its origin. The *dramatis personae* are the Governor, the chief Alguacil, the Güegüence ("the old man"), his two sons Forcico and Ambrosio, Lady Suchi-Malinche (daughter of the Governor), the Royal Secretary and the Registrar. The *mutae personae* are the women and the maskers, the mules (*machos*). Throughout the whole of the first half of the drama the action and dialogue are confined exclusively to the *dramatis personae*, without any reference whatever being made by them to the *mutae personae*, who appear in an abrupt way shortly after the middle point has been reached. The action in the first part turns upon a series of bal-

¹Güegüence, p. xviii.

lets performed by the Güegüence and his two sons, in which both the Governor and the Alguacil sometimes take part, the *entr'actes* being filled in with a cross-fire of innuendos, racy speeches and sharp retorts between the old man and his sons (in the presence of the above-named government officials), one of whom always corroborates the bombastic statements of his father, while the other with equal pertinacity endeavors to show him up as an inveterate liar. The Governor now and then calls the interlocutors to order, and demands of them some old historic dance, which is accordingly performed. After the maskers are brought on, which is done at the request of the Governor, numerous jokes of a questionable character are perpetrated at the expense of the women and the *machos*, and then they finally wind up with the marriage of the Güegüence's favorite son, Don Forcico, to Suchi-Malinche, the Governor's daughter. According to custom on such occasions, the young groom's father makes a present of wine to the girl's father, and then Güegüence with his tribe sets off on the mules, leaving the Governor and the other members of his council to enjoy their feast.

Before considering the particular phase of language that this mixed text represents, we must call up the condition of the Spanish when it was brought into contact with the aboriginal tongue. The formal conquest of Nicaragua took place, as we have just seen, in 1522. Precisely a quarter of a century after this, that is in 1547, Cervantes was born, and, again, exactly forty years later, Lope de Vega first saw the light. It may reasonably be supposed that it took at least half a century for the Spanish to make any perceptible inroad upon the idiom with which it had come into contact; in truth, it was not till towards the end of the sixteenth century that the Spaniards had become so thorough masters, politically, of their new territory as to exercise anything like a centralized power over it, and we must naturally suppose, therefore, that the impression before this date of the analytic tongue of the Europeans upon the polysynthetic idiom of their subjects could not have been very great, or, at least, not sufficient to have built up an independent jargon with pretty definite laws of morphology and of syntax. To have destroyed the flexional character of the Spanish and to have reduced it to the agglutinated state in which it appears often in the text before us, must have required a long series of years of attrition and admixture. We have, therefore, in a consideration of this dialect, to take as our basis the classic Spanish of the time of Cervantes

and Lope de Vega, with its now obsolete grammar-forms and antiquated constructions, and to this add the varying dialect influences which must have been brought to bear on the new product by the common speech of the Spanish soldiers.

As in the phonetic products of all languages belonging to the tropics, we should naturally expect to find here, in the results of Nahuatl influence on Spanish, a general tendency to broaden the close sounds and to lift them in the scale of phonic production. In many cases this tendency agrees with special dialect effects. That such disposition is actually the case in the Güegüence we see from almost the first line, in examples like *Velancicos* (= Sp. *Villancicos*), *seno* (O. Sp. *sines*, *senes*), *semula* (*simila*), etc., etc., where the *i*, both tonic and atonic, has been strengthened and raised to the *e* stage. In Latin we have a similar interchange between *u* and *i* in such forms as *testumonium* (for *testimonium*), *pontufex* (for *pontifex*), and in the Spanish *zurujano* (for *cirujano*). In this special phonetic trait of the Nahuatl-Spanish, both the old and Folk's language of Spain agree, so that it becomes difficult in certain cases to determine to which of these two influences the fuller vowel-product ought to be assigned. To judge from the numerous examples in which the processes of development are different, and where the common speech has deviated from the traditional literary type, we must conclude that there was a very strong drift in favor of the popular element, even though the vowel-coloring of the language in which these changes were produced was well settled by natural growth and established literary usage. This same tendency to raise the weak vowels we find illustrated in the Old Latin by the vacillation between *e* and *i* in such forms as *tempestatebus*, *mereto*, compared with the classic *tempestatibus*, *merito*. In the Spanish Folk's speech it was the *e*-form that was kept, and especially at this period of the language pretonic *i* was constantly represented by *e*, as in *Cecilia* for *Cicilia*, *dejiste* for *dijiste*, *adevinar* for *adivinar*, etc. Even in the tonic the same phenomenon is not unfrequent, *e. g.* *mesmo* for *mismo*. Such examples as these show that the same propensity was strongly rooted in the Spanish of home-growth in the sixteenth century, and has been kept up, even down into the present idiom, for the purpose of syllable differentiation in the forms *ceniza* (*cinis*), *ceñir* (*cingere*), *concebir* (*concipere*), *corregir* (*corrigere*), etc. The Castilian, furthermore, furnishes us with striking evidence of a constant disturbance of its legitimate vowel-system when applied to other non-accented vowels, as in

ermado (for *armado*), *reson* (for *razon*), etc., which are simple instances of the levelling process pushed one step further than we have it in the Nicaraguan Spanish. On the other hand, the more common raising of the vowel-power from *e* to *a* is in accordance with the usual Spanish dialect influence, *e. g.* *Amilio Castalar* (for *Emilio Castelar*), *ajercito* (for *ejercito*), used by the Folk in Castile, is especially marked in the moulding of Nahuatl forms to suit the requirements of Spanish flexion or to satisfy the demands of Spanish euphony. The Nahuatl "particle of contra-position" *yē* has passed to the *a*-state in *ya*; *mocemati* ("presumptuously") is *mosamonte*, where, too, we find at the same time a thickening of the final *i* and an epenthetical *n* before dental, such as we have it in the differentiated Castilian forms *empleita*, *emplenta*, *rendar* (*reiterare*), (cf. Michaëlis, *Studien zur romanischen Wortschöpfung*, p. 244). *Nemi* ("to live") gives us *neme*. In the same way *a* is broadened into *o* in such forms as *hoy*, etc. *E = o* in *seno* = Old Spanish *sines* or *senes*, with apocopation of the final consonant, as in the *hemo* of our text. We find this same broadening of vowel in the modern *obispo* (*episcopus*), in the Old Spanish *romanecer* (for *remanecer*). In one example, *persogue* (*Dios persogue á mi amigo*), we have the *e* represented by *o*, which, however, I would take as a probable corruption of copyist, since we have the same verb several times in its simple *i*-form when it is not compounded with the preposition, *e. g.* in *siguale*. The common vowel changes, therefore, that we find in the Nahuatl, and which separate it from the classical Spanish and bind it with the old and dialect forms of the same, are *e = i*, *o = e*, *o = a*. The only exceptions that I have discovered of the opposite process, that is, reduction of the phonetic value of the vowel, belongs to *e* in combination with a nasal, as is shown in the strongly dialectic form *tin*, which the editor would take from the root *ten* (*tenere*), and would regard "as a good illustration of the wearing away of forms in this mixed dialect."

Turning now to the consonants, we meet here equally interesting traces of the old Castilian idiom, or, which amounts to about the same thing, of dialect peculiarities. These affect, for the most part, certain classes of consonants only, namely, gutturals and sibilants, medial or final. In the first title itself of the *Baile* we have the aspirated Nahuatl *h* of *huehue*, "old man," passing regularly into the medial guttural, similar to the transference of the Gothic *h* from Teutonic to certain parts of the Romance soil.

For initials, the most striking thing to notice is the treatment of the Nahuatl aspirate *h* and the Castilian guttural *x*. That the quality of this *h* in Nahuatl was aspirate, and similar to that of the O. H. G., which, in certain cases, has crossed over into Italian in the sonant state, there can be no doubt, from the testimony of De Olmos, a Franciscan monk, who, as far back as 1547, that is, only a quarter of a century after the conquest of Mexico, composed a grammar of the native Mexican, in which (p. 197) he says: "la *h* unas vezes parece que la comen, y otras vezes la pronuncian mucho." In this leading title of the comedy, the proper name Güegüence, we have two striking characteristics of Spanish dialect influence, namely, the passage of *h* into sonant guttural *g*, and the lowering of the vowel *u* to *ü* in the Nahuatl word *huehue*, "old man," a mode of dealing with the initial combination *hu* that is found in various districts of the Spanish peninsula, but it is especially the Asturian who always says *güertu*, *güeso* for Castilian *huerto*, *hueso*, etc. Compare also the Venitian *garbo* = O. H. G. *haru*, N. H. G. *herb*; the Tuscan *gufo* = O. H. G. *háf*, *hávo*, where there has been a similar exchange of the initial guttural, without, however, the reduction of the vowel. In *güil* (= Old Spanish *quel* = *que* + *el*) we have the same tendency manifest for the mutes, which, in truth, throughout this comedy are constantly run over into mediae whether they are initial or medial, but it is particularly in the latter position that this change takes place, as may be seen below.

Next to the passage of pure voiceless to voiced gutturals comes the change respectively of the interdental and guttural spirants *z*, *x* to the simple alveolar *s*. For the former (*z*, *s*, *c*) we have evidence out of the sixteenth century, that is about the time the Spaniards came into contact with the Mexicans, that they began even then to run into one another in sound, and the old distinction of *ç* to represent the mute, and *z* the sonant, spirant was gradually broken down, and in one dialect at least the tradition has been kept up. The Cuban, for example, makes no difference of sound whether the graphic sign be *c*, *z*, or *s*; they are all the simple sibilant *s* for him. So, too, the Andalusian, in spite of the rule laid down by the Spanish Academy at the beginning of the eighteenth century (after all differentiation of *ç* and *z* had disappeared from Castilian) that *c* should be written before *e*, *i*, and *z* before *a*, *o*, *u*, and that both consonants should be pronounced exactly alike—the Andalusian, I say, persists in saying *murc* (*ç*) *ia*,

and not *murc(th)ia*. The Aztec Spaniard does the same thing, as is evidenced in *sapatetas* for *zapatetas*, etc.

The interchange of *x* and *s* which we find in *silguero* for *xilguero* comes up as dialect peculiarity early in the language, since the *Dialogo de las lenguas*, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, mentions it, e. g. *en muchas partes de Castilla convierten la s en j (x) y per saster dicen xastre*. In the middle of the sixteenth century, Charpentier tells us, the *x* was pronounced like the *sci* of the Italians, that is, as a simple English *sh*-sound. So, too, Pedro di Alcalá, at the beginning of the century, expressed the Arabic *dsch*, *sch*, by the Spanish *j*, *x* (Förster, Span. Sprachlehre, p. 16), in other words, as a palatal, just as we have it to-day in Gallician and Asturian, and corresponding exactly to the modern Portuguese pronunciation.¹

The Arabs of Spain were accustomed to represent the unknown quantity of their mathematics by this simple term "thing" (شيء) just as the early Italian algebraists did with their *cosa* (= "thing"), which was either written out in full or indicated by a sign. The Arabs, also following the same system, placed the first letter (*s*) of their word *šai* over the numeral, for example $\overset{\text{š}}{12}(\text{ش}) = 12x$, and as the Span. *x* of that period was exactly the same in value as this *š* (= Eng. *sh*), nothing was more natural than the substitution by the Spanish mathematicians, of the Latin for the Arabic sign. Instead of *x* the author thinks, therefore, we should read *šai*.

This sound, then, that was carried into Mexico differed very materially from the guttural spirant of the present Castilian, and we find its palatal character maintained in the words cited above. But as a medial only does the full force of its true palatal nature become manifest through numerous examples, and especially where this mutation of form belongs to Nahuatl words in which

¹ Prof. Paul Haupt has kindly called my attention to an interesting article in the Gött. Gel. Anz. 1882, No. 13, by Paul de Lagarde, entitled "Woher stammt das *x* der Mathematiker?" The author here shows very clearly that the custom of our present notation of an unknown quantity by the letter *x* sprang from the equivalence in phonetic value of the initial consonant of the Arabic شيء (*šai*), "thing" (= *res* = Italian *cosa*) with the Spanish *x*. شيء (*šai* = *xai*) was reduced to simple ش (*š* = *x*) which in sound was faithfully represented by this Spanish letter.

the *x* plays an important rôle. Such words as *mascamayagua* (*maxca* + *mayacuela*), *n-isti-pampa* (*n-ixtlipampa*), etc., show what must have been the phonetic value of this compound sign in the mouth of the Mexican Spaniard. But if we thus discover some interesting traces of dialect usage in the initial spirants and guttural explosivæ, these characteristics become much more abundant when we pass to the medial consonants. Here not only the sonants of the original language are scrupulously kept, but there is also a very strong inclination to run all mutes over into this class, whether they belong to Latin or Nahuatl elements. In the latter especially, the drift is so powerful for the gutturals as to almost obliterate in some cases the primitive aspect of the vocable. We thus find medial *g* playing again the double rôle of an original *h* or *qu*, e. g. *eguan* (*ihuan*), *Teguan* (*Tehuantin*), *calagua* (*calaquia*), *mayagua* (*mayacuele*), *negualigua* (*necuilhuia*), *sepâne-galigua* (*-calaquia*), *tumaguiso* (*tumaquiça*), etc., all of which may be found in Dr. Brinton's little vocabulary given at the end of his Güegüence.

With reference to the finals we have that natural word-shortening and reduction of form according to the "Law of Least Action," which pre-eminently characterizes all Folk's speech. Not only are vowels lopped off, but consonants follow them with apparently the same facility, and, in this way, the long native Mexican words are brought into reasonable compass, for example, *mayague* (*mayacuele*), *necana* (*nequanaliztli*), *guajaqueño* (*quauhuauqui*). But this extensive process of apocopation is not confined to the Mexican elements of the dialect. Just as final *l* and *r* are constantly cut off in Andalusian, so that we have such forms as *papé* (for *papel*), *caudá* (for *caudal*), *seño* (for *señor*), *mujé* (for *mujer*), so we find here in the Mexican Spanish an apocopation of final *s* in the forms *seno* (Old Span. *senes*), *hemo* for *hemos*, with the original signification of the Latin *habere*. I would attribute the loss of consonant, however, in these cases not to special Spanish dialect action, but rather to the influence of the native tongue, which possessed no *s*-sign. This full sibilant is represented more or less faithfully in the Aztec by the combination *tz*, which passes regularly into the simple *s*-form in our text, for example, in the vocative combination *no piltze* = *no pilse*, etc.

The disappearance of final *n* is common, e. g. *teguane* (*tehuantin*). Syncopation is a very frequent process for certain letters of Nahuatl combination, especially of *l* in connection with *t*,

petate (*petlatli*), *petaca* (*petlacalli*), *tatita* (*tatli*), *ticino* (*ticitl*), *chocola* (*chocolatl*), *n-isti-pampa* (*-ixtli-*). The Spanish, too, has suffered in this way, though very little compared with the native language, as in the examples *guanacos* (for *guanacos*), *asetato* (for *asientato*). In its morphology, the Nahuatl Spanish separates itself more clearly from the modern language than in its phonology. The Mexican has had little influence here so far as the individual word is concerned. In the nomen-series the Spanish has been able to maintain its shape, though often mixed up promiscuously with native elements, as we shall see when we come to the syntax. Old Spanish forms, with special dialect influence, are here the chief factors that constitute the difference between the new mixture and the Castilian of to-day. We have already noted *güil*, to which we may add *de onde*, *indenantes*, *a onde*, *para onde*, *seno* (Old Spanish *sines*).

Diminutives and augmentatives abound, just as we might naturally expect to find in the Folk's speech. But it is especially in the verb that we note the most striking characteristics both of a stage of language older than the present Castilian and of the extensive play of dialect power. We cite the following: *hemo* (for *hemos*), *asetato* (for *asientato*), alongside of which we have the full form *sientato*; *dobla* (for *doblado*), representing the apocopated imperative in Old Spanish, *vuestro furor ejecutá en mi vida* (*Garcilaso*), quoted by Foerster, Span. Sprachlehre, p. 320. There is a strong tendency to keep the vowel of the infinitive, even in cases where it is only graphic, and where the modern language has syncopated it, as is shown by the subjunctive form *sigua* for modern *sigas*. The contract second person plural of the Old Spanish comes up in *tiens* (cf. Old Span. *tenés* = *tenedes*), with diphthongisation of the root-vowel carried through the non-accented forms, such as we have it in Modern French *aimez* (originally *amez*). In this verb *tener* throughout, and in *ver*, "to see," we discover some extraordinary freaks of the popular idiom, namely, the reduced root *tin* represents the second person singular, first and third persons plural, that is, *tiènes*, *tenémos* and *tiénen*, while *tiènes* supplies the place of the second plural *tenéis*; and, similarly, the present tense, third plural of *ver* (*ven*, p. 60) is used to replace the second person plural *véis*. This is a common usage in dialect speech, as, for example, in all the North French dialects a like phenomenon is shown, in that the persons of the different tenses are not kept strictly apart; and even where each one has a

form to itself, different persons are frequently changed one for another. Compare, especially, the Maine and Paris species.

Another example of contract formation we find in *aventastes* (p. 56), Old Span. for *aventásteis*, and, again, *seres* for *seréis* (p. 56), *aviastes* for *aviásteis* (p. 62). But the most interesting peculiarity of the verb formation is seen in the future, which is built up almost exclusively in the regular periphrastic manner of the Romance languages, save that the component elements are not welded together, that is, the auxiliary is kept distinct from the infinitive by means of the relational *de*, so that we have *ha de hablar*, *ha de ser*, *has de tener*, *ha de hacer*, *ha de estar*, etc. It is thus we have the special idiomatic futures that represent "duty, intention, design, possible possession," passing over sometimes into a state of verbal action which does not bear these special significations. These full elemental forms stand instead of the rarer compound futures which mark simple future action and are composed of the parts bound together into a single whole. There are only a few of this latter type in the whole play before us, and they serve simply to denote indefinite future conditions without any limitations whatever.

In the new word-building of this dialect we find the same modes of procedure which come up in the adaptation of Teutonic roots to Romance uses, that is, we frequently have the original Nahuatl word, with or without apocopation, treated as a stem to which the Latin termination is hung on for the new compound. Of these there are numerous examples in the short text of the Güegüence, such as *guajaqueño* = Nah. *quanhuaqui* + Latin suffix *ineus*, which is generally used to form patronymics, as in *madrileño*, *estremeño* (from *Estremadura*), *malagueño*, etc.; *palparesia* = Nah. *papal* ("conversation") + *itia*; *tic-ino* = Nah. *ticill* ("a native doctor") + *inus*, *tat-ito* = Nah. *tatl* ("father") + the diminutive *ita*.

Besides this process of creating new forms out of the native elements plus Latin terminations, many peculiar types of purely Spanish or Latin origin are produced by syncopation, prosthesis, apocopation, etc., that are characteristic of the popular idiom. In *asetato*, for example, for *asientato*, we have the relational *a*, which, together with the syncopation of *n* before *t*, gives us an essentially different product in appearance from the ordinary Spanish *sientate*. These participial parasynthetics in *a*, bearing a full causal force, are abundant in the Raetian, and more especially the Ladinian branch of it, where the legitimate process of producing a factitive signifi-

cation is confined to the present participle. *Rujeros* for *rujidos*, by a change of *d* to *r*, is illustrated in the Andalusian *Garitana* for *Gaditana*, *mentira* for *mentida* (cf. Michaelis, p. 236); but this is only the continuation of a similar phenomenon that comes up in the Latin *meridies* for *medidies*, and Old Latin according to Priscian gives us *arfari*, *arvolare*, *arvenire* (cf. Förster, Span. Sprach.).¹ In *Silguerio* the Latin termination *arium* has been preserved in its full force instead of the reduced *ero*, such as we find it in the Castilian of to-day.

The use of epenthetical *n* we have seen in *mosamonte* = Nah. *mocemati*, where the intercalation of this letter is similar to the Spanish *linterna*, *rendir*, etc. The word *cele* in the oft-recurring expression *no me cele*, I would take directly from the Latin *calere*. The Latin *calet aliqua re* has passed into the impersonal construction *mihi calet*, etc., which again, for the verb, has turned into the French *chaloir*. The negative participial form of this verb is preserved to us in the Modern French *non-chalant*. Note also the Provençal *caler*: *Amors gitat m'avetz a no m'en cal*, Aimeric de Pegulhan. The Old Spanish form was identical with that of the Provençal, and we find accordingly *poco me cala* (Poema de Alejandro 140, as quoted in Diez' Wörterbuch, *sub voce*). The Italian possesses this verb also, as is seen from examples like *non me ne cale* (*ibidem*), etc. Its existence is thus assured in four out of the six principal languages of the Romance group. The peculiar quality of the root-vowel in our text is due to the Folk's speech as described above.

But with all the above-mentioned changes of both phonology and morphology we do not have the dialect character of the Güegüence so well established as in its syntax. It is here especially that we find the strong influence in certain cases of the native idiom, and again witness more directly than anywhere else the strong drift towards a strictly agglutinated form of language in which all flexion has disappeared, and where nothing but the context alone serves us in trying to discover the thought of the writer. A mixing of subjunctive and imperative moods in the same sentence to express a command, the use of nouns as adjectives, the use of the preposition *a* not only before a personal object (the legitimate Spanish usage), but also before an impersonal accusative, the dative without any case-sign, as is seen some-

¹ For the discovery of this interesting interchange in French phonetics cf. A. Tobler, Romania II 241-244. For various theories as to how it took place cf. G. Paris, Français R = D, Rom. VI 129-133; L. Havet, Français R pour D., Rom. VI 254-257; Joret, Mém. de la Soc. de lang. III 161.

times in Norman, the separation of *para* from its infinitive by an intercalated phrase, *para en chocolá brindar*, a general characteristic of the older stages of word-relation in the Romance languages, —these are only a few phases of construction that separate this dialect from the present Castilian. In the majority of cases, however, the Spanish construction has been adhered to; in truth, this has been carried out so faithfully in so many instances, and the sequence of tenses so scrupulously maintained, the strikingly idiomatic expressions of Spanish used so naturally and fluently, that one might almost be led to believe it the language of a Spaniard himself. This is not the view held, however, by the editor, who draws most of his arguments, with reference to its authorship, from the artistic form of the comedy. The mode of presentation he does not find Spanish; but it may naturally be asked, I think, whether the author, had he been of Spanish blood, would not have done all in his power to adopt for his piece that style and *mise en scène* which appealed especially to his hearers? It would seem to me *a priori* improbable that a native who, in the beginning of the *Baile*, mixes so much Nahuatl with his Spanish, should stick so closely to the traditions of Romance syntax. The evidence drawn from the peculiar use of words and the knowledge of their intimate relations in special phrase-settings would point naturally to a Spanish author. If he were a native he must have been imbued with the spirit of the Spanish to such a degree as to forget, in a great measure, the usages of his mother-tongue. The mutilations of the Mexican, as given by the able editor in the vocabulary of peculiar words following the Güegüence text, would rather point to a man imperfectly acquainted with that language, which he was trying to use alongside of his own by transferring to it most of the characteristics of word-formation that existed in his native speech. This point, however, I do not regard of so much importance as another that pertains to its non-unity of composition, namely, I think there is strong internal evidence for believing that the whole comedy is not by one and the same author, but rather made up of two comedies or parts of comedies that bore the names respectively of Güegüence and El Macho-raton. I am aware that it is the custom to give to Spanish dramas a dual title even when they are produced by one and the same author, but then the language and other concomitants of scenic representation agree throughout, and thus show a uniformity of treatment which I do not find in the Güegüence. My suspicions in this direction were first aroused by the change of language that takes place about the

point where *El macho-raton* is first mentioned, that is, from about the fiftieth page of the text onward as it is here published with translation. The proportion of Nahuatl words is smaller from this point forward than in the first part of the work, especially in the speeches of the Governor and Alguacil. The language of the Güegüence and his sons, in a majority of cases, is almost pure Spanish in character and composition, whereas towards the beginning of the work they are often understood with difficulty by one who does not know the native idiom. Diminutives are more abundant in part first than in part second; in other words, the early portion seems to me more especially of a character belonging to the common people. The use of the masculine for the neuter demonstrative pronoun is the rule of the beginning, while it is employed correctly in the second division of the comedy. A fourth consideration, of a purely external, mechanical nature, however, seems to point to a difference of authorship and perhaps of age, namely, the irregularity in the use of diacritical signs. Before the *macho-raton* is mentioned we have only two or three examples of the use of the grave accent, and these not in the body of the text, but simply in the stage regulations; whereas, after the maskers are introduced, there is a strange mixture of acute (Spanish) and grave accents even in the same line (cf. p. 62). It may be claimed that this confusion was due to the copyist, but if so, why should we not have the same irregularity in the first part? In the special Güegüence portion, the acute, that is, the legitimate Spanish accent, is used with regularity, except in a few cases of omission altogether, which is natural in a work of this character, as in dialect and popular texts everywhere.

From these differences in purity of language and correctness of mechanical representation, I think the conclusion may be drawn with a certain degree of probability that the *macho-raton* part of the work is of an epoch different from the Güegüence proper. If this were not so, why should not the proportion of Nahuatl remain about the same, or even increase, as there was greater opportunity for its use in the increased variety of subjects presented by the introduction of new personages? Is it possibly because the native element was not so well understood at the time when the second part was written, and hence the less mixed character of the Spanish belonging to it?

From the discrepancies here mentioned I would venture to suggest the probability of the adaptation of a separate text of different authorship and age from the early portion of this work, for the second part, and that this portion is younger than the beginning of it.

A. M. ELLIOTT.